

### **REMARKS**

The Non-final office action of April 19, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claim 18 has been amended for clarity. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 18-35 are pending.

Claims 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima (U.S. Pat. No. 5,909,184) in view of Sharp (U.S. Pat. No. 6,526,284). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 recites a mobile phone. Tajima discloses an FM receiver ("FM broadcast receiving section 30 that receives FM broadcast radiowaves and produces the corresponding sound" – col. 4, lines 36-40 and FIG. 5). However, Tajima fails to teach or suggest a mobile phone. In fact, nowhere does Tajima teach or suggest a device with any capability of being used as a two-way communication device at all.

The Office Action cites Tajima at "FIG. 5, number 31" for providing a mobile phone. However, "number 31" in FIG. 5 is an antenna for receiving FM broadcasts (see, e.g., col. 4, line 45-46: "the broadcast receiving section 30 comprises an antenna 31 for receiving FM broadcast radiowaves."). Contrary to the Office Action's assertion, the antenna 31 of Tajima is not a mobile phone.

Tajima also fails to teach or suggest a mobile phone comprising a broadband AM and/or FM radio signal receiver or a radio channel memory for storing a plurality of radio channel settings of a broadband AM and/or FM radio station received in the messages with the receiver. The Office Action asserts that Tajima provides a radio channel memory for storing a plurality of radio channel settings at col. 4, lines 36-67 and col. 5, lines 1-13. However, Tajima merely discloses components of an FM receiver. The radio receiver of Tajima includes a ROM 44 that stores the processing programs for control section 43, a data memory 47 that stores received information and an input data memory 48 that stores input information from a key input section 5. However, none of the ROM 44 or data memory 47 or 48 is disclosed as storing a radio channel setting contained in a received message.

Furthermore, claim 18 recites that the radio channel setting is contained in a received message transmitted via the mobile phone network. Tajima fails to teach or suggest a message transmitted via a mobile phone network. Indeed, Tajima fails to teach or suggest a mobile phone or a mobile phone network at all.

Sharp fails to cure the defects of Tajima. Sharp discloses a server and a database storing geographic information such as map images, weather information, traffic congestion, etc (col. 5, lines 59-65). The geographic information is routed through a remote computer (see, e.g., col. 7, lines 4-15) and to transmitters 50 that broadcast the geographic information to receiving devices 70 (see, e.g., col. 10, lines 41- 45). Sharp, like Tajima, fails to teach or suggest a mobile phone comprising a broadband AM and/or FM radio signal receiver. Also, Sharp, like Tajima, fails to teach or suggest a radio channel memory for storing a plurality of radio channel settings. In fact, Sharp merely discloses geographic information (e.g., map images) and fails to teach or suggest radio channel settings at all.

In addition, there is no motivation to combine the Tajima and Sharp references. The Office Action asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Tajima with Sharp “to provide a quick communication feature for the mobile users.” This alleged “motivation” fails to bear any relevance to either of Tajima, Sharp, or the instant application. According to the Office Action, one of ordinary skill in the art, given the Tajima disclosure of an FM receiver would have been motivated to combine the disclosure of Sharp of a transmission system for broadcasting geographic information such as map images with the FM receiver of Tajima in order to “provide a quick communication feature for mobile users.” This does not make sense because broadcasting geographic information to the FM receiver would not result in a “quick communication feature.” In fact, broadcasting geographic information is unrelated to whether the “communication feature” is “quick” or “not quick”.

In addition, it would not make sense to broadcast geographic map images of Sharp to the FM receiver of Tajima. The FM receiver of Tajima receives audio information (FM signals) and is not disclosed as containing a means for displaying (graphical) map images. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to broadcast information (of Sharp) to the Tajima

FM receiver if the Tajima FM receiver is incapable of receiving or processing that broadcast information.

Furthermore, the Tajima FM receiver receives data over an FM broadcast network. Tajima fails to teach or suggest that the FM receiver is operable in a mobile phone network as recited in claim 18.

The Office Action therefore has failed to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 26 is similar to claim 18 and is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 18. Claims 23, 27, 28, and 35 depend from claim 18 or claim 26 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 18 or claim 26 and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

Claims 19 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima, Sharp and Konisi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,181,921) in view of Kim (U.S. Pat. No. 6,597,918). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 19 and 24 depend from claim 18. As set forth above Tajima and Sharp, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest claim 18. Konisi and/or Kim fail to cure the deficiencies of Tajima and Sharp. The Office Action relies on Konisi and Kim for allegedly providing features recited in claim 19 or claim 24. Nevertheless, the combination of Tajima, Sharp, Konisi and Kim fails to teach or suggest claim 18. Nor does the Office Action assert that the combination of references does.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima, Sharp, Konisi, Kim and further in view of Gupte (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0055350). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 20 depends from claim 18. As set forth above Tajima, Sharp, Konisi, and Kim, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest claim 18. Gupte fails to cure the deficits of

Tajima, Sharp, Konisi, and Kim. Nor does the Office Action assert that the combination of references does.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima, Sharp, Konisi, Kim, Gupte, and further in view of Cummings-Hill (U.S. Pat. No. 6,470,178). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 depends from claim 18. As set forth above Tajima, Sharp, Konisi, Kim, and Gupte, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest claim 18. Cummings-Hill fails to cure the deficits of Tajima, Sharp, Konisi, Kim, and Gupte. Nor does the Office Action assert that the combination of references does.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 22, 25, 31, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima, Sharp, and Konisi in view of Villa-Real (U.S. Pat. No. 4,481,382). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 22, 25, 31, and 32 depend from claim 18 or claim 26. As set forth above Tajima, Sharp, and Konisi, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest claim 18 or claim 26. Villa-Real fails to cure the deficits of Tajima, Sharp, and Konisi. Nor does the Office Action assert that the combination of references does.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima, Sharp and Konisi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 29 and 30 depend from claim 26. As set forth above, the combination of Tajima, Sharp, and Konisi fails to teach or suggest claim 26. Nor does the Office Action assert that the combination of references does.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same.

Date: July 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: William J. Allen 51,393  
William J. Allen  
Registration No. 51,393  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
10 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 3000  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312-463-5000  
Fax: 312-463-5001